

Baranets, S.N.; Buychik, A.; Gontar, N.N. Relevance to define responsibility for decision-making in the documents of strategic development of the Russian Federation's subjects // European Scientific e-Journal, December 27, 2020.
ESEJ: jur2020-12-001
DOI: 10.47451/jur2020-12-001

Sergey N. Baranets

Associate Professor

Candidate of Sciences in Philosophie

Department of State and Municipal Administration

North-West Institute of Management

The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration

E-mail: baranets-sn@ranepa.ru

Alexander Buychik

Doctor of Economical Sciences, PhD of Social and Political Sciences

Chief Director

European Scientific e-Journal

Ostrava, Czech Republic

E-mail: chief@buychik.eu

Nina N. Gontar

Associate Professor

Candidate of Sciences in Jurisprudence

Department of State and Municipal Administration

North-West Institute of Management

The Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration

E-mail: gontar-nn@ranepa.ru

Relevance to define responsibility for decision-making in the documents of strategic development of the Russian Federation's subjects

Abstract:

The article analyzes the theoretical foundations and problems of the formation of the corpus of strategic planning documents in terms of identifying eligible entities as carriers of responsibility for their preparation and execution. Using the example of the Strategy for Economic and Social Development of St Petersburg for the period up to 2035, an attempt is made to determine the scope and subjects of responsibility for making state-type management decisions suitable for implementation at the level of a specific subject within Russia. The authors propose approaches to solving the problems of correctly identifying the subjects of responsibility according to the goals of the strategy for further monitoring and identifying legal violations in the activities of authorities while discussing important political and legal issues of responsibility of public authorities to citizens and the business community.

Keywords:

responsibility, state and municipal structures, decision-making, development strategy, city.

Баранец Сергей Николаевич

доцент, кандидат философских наук

Кафедра государственного и муниципального управления

Северо-Западный институт управления

Российская Академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы

E-mail: baranets-sn@ranepa.ru

Alexander Buychik

Доктор экономических наук, PhD социальных и политических наук

генеральный директор

European Scientific e-Journal

Острава, Чехия

E-mail: chief@buychik.eu

Nina N. Gontar

доцент, кандидат юридических наук

Кафедра государственного и муниципального управления

Северо-Западный институт управления

Российская Академия народного хозяйства и государственной службы

E-mail: gontar-nn@ranepa.ru

Государственные решения: управленческие потенциалы и проблемы определения ответственности в документах стратегического развития субъектов Российской Федерации

Аннотация:

В статье проводится анализ теоретических основ и проблем формирования корпуса документов стратегического планирования с точки зрения определения правомочных субъектов в качестве носителей ответственности за их подготовку и исполнение. На примере Стратегии экономического и социального развития Санкт-Петербурга на период до 2035 года реализована попытка определения сферы и субъектов ответственности за принятие управленческих решений государственного типа, пригодных для реализации на уровне специфического субъекта в составе России. Авторы предлагают подходы к решению вопросов корректного определения субъектов ответственности по целям стратегии для дальнейшего контроля и определения правовых нарушений в деятельности органов власти, обсуждая при этом важные политико-правовые вопросы ответственности органов государственной власти перед гражданами и бизнес-сообществом.

Ключевые слова:

ответственность, государственные и муниципальные структуры, управленческие решения, стратегия развития, город.

Introduction

In the Russian management and special legal literature of the current period, this issue is presented and studied, in the opinion of the group of the authors, extremely poorly,

especially in terms of analyzing the existence of the fact of responsibility and its presentation in the relevant documentation. In the analysis of a large number of works dealing with various managerial and legal aspects of responsibility of certain officials and authorities, found the omission appears to be a fairly important issue regarding the presence and determine if the responsibility as such in the framework of the type of the documents, which are fundamental to the development of the country, that relate to the strategic planning documents of federal, regional and municipal levels.

Thus, there is an objective need for an integrated analysis of the political and legal basis to develop and implement the statutory set of documents of strategic development of territories to identify the presence and determine the degree of responsibility of organizations, officials and administrative structures for the management decisions required for technologically competent and legal needs to control the country's strategic planning processes. The higher the level of generalization of plans, programs and projects of strategic development, the more, in the opinion of the group of the authors, the areas of responsibility, its forms and, accordingly, the subjects of responsibility themselves are institutionalized, formalized and partially personified. It should be noted that their presence is the only guarantee of the exhaustive implementation of all parameters and conditions defined by a specific strategic planning document following the requirements of the 172nd Federal Law [12].

However, it is worth noting that in its essential manifestations, this problem is closely related to a whole complex of not yet fully resolved issues arising from various interpretations of theoretical and methodological and partly philosophical and legal prerequisites that can give an adequate understanding and interpretation of a more general problem of public authorities' participation in the process of initiating and implementing socially significant decisions at different stages of their adoption and implementation.

State authorities, directly or indirectly participating in the process of determining the current agenda, thereby determine the field of possible future, in connection with which any issue of public importance, any potential innovation in public life and any latent conflict can become the subject of discussion, the choice of development options, and therefore political decisions. Representing an integral system of management type, the state power represented by its authors, bodies and institutions, on the one hand, is closed

to itself, represents a special environment, in which significant (public and legal) decisions are generally hatched and adopted for implementation. On the other hand, any power is more or less open to its environment, which it tries to command (forcing its subjects to adopt a common style of life and its reproduction) and to rule (forcing its subjects to act according to the rules defined by the power, accepted at a given time and in a given place).

1.

At different stages of the political process in its managerial dimension, various tasks are set, the general meaning of which is to translate into reality the conceived and adopted decisions of the authorities, developed, as is commonly believed, in the interests of the whole society or some significant part of it. Each country of the modern world has its peculiarities in understanding and organizing these processes. However, there are general laws concerning how each of the branches of state power (and the municipal power that imitates it), as well as each body in a particular branch of government, is invested by its participation in the overall process of state political management. The meaning and purpose of state participation in the process of designing and systematic implementation of state decisions, which are ultimately reduced to a set of legal, regulatory and regulatory (organizing) acts, is to express, record, and clearly present to public opinion the results of their decisive actions by means of approving the right and procedure to represent the interests of a part of society to express, record and clearly present to public opinion the results of their decisive, decisive and resolving (giving the right to legitimate actions) conclusions and ideas about how this or that relevant or important public problem should be overcome or resolved, what means and forces should be used for this, and who on behalf of the state should carry out this activity. It is in this regard that the state and its bodies prove their capacity and solvency in the eyes of society. In cyclic, phasic, rhythmic change of individual phases of the process of passing future state political and administrative decisions as project management and legal activities verified by the organization of the state apparatus and its ability to express the will to have power, which will agree or not agree with the decision-maker or body that is mandated to pursue the case.

The process of development, adoption and implementation of state policy decisions deserves special analysis. The general principles and methodological approaches developed in decision-making theory need a special interpretation to apply to the political sphere and will not work automatically. All stages and regularities of the process of development and decision-making can be present, and, nevertheless, when avoiding the specification of special qualities of the political, the fine line between what is and what is due, the ideal and reality disappear (or in any case is violated). In this case, dialectical balancing in the circle of attraction of various kinds' opposites looks like a burdensome luxury, and imperative generic social instincts, which are extremely difficult to rationalize, come into play. The solution as an answer to a problematic issue of a vital nature requires a moment of reflection, an analytical-synthetic phase, clarification of the relevance of tendentialities, and Homo Politicus often simply do not have time for such mental actions.

If to begin studying the process of political interactions, then for many, the essence of political action will be reduced to making wise and fair decisions about the current trends in the development of phenomena in the political life of society and offering optimal ways to implement these wise decisions in life [1]. However, if any decisions are made, it means that someone needs it. The reference point of the common good, as well as the unshakable status of the modern interpretation of the human right to a better life, completes this completely rational picture, within which almost any supporter of the ideas of political activism for the sake of freedom gets used to argue. However, for the modern worldview, the activist value-worldview paradigm is clearly not enough, and it must be supplemented by other worldview pictures and approaches to action (and therefore the decision to act), without which political reality is impoverished and deprived of many important nuances. To find an adequate management-power sphere theory of decision-making, the methodology of their development and implementation, as well as methods of calculation and other operations that can take into account not only the costs and benefits but also the subtle plan of human relations and relationships, is still the task of the future, but a considerable number of authors have long been thoroughly and actively engaged in these searches, and some of them (including among political scientists and sociologists) do this quite successfully.

According to S.G. Turonok that it is “the systematic study of public policy (in the form of an analysis of past or evaluation of existing political decisions) with a clear intention to apply the lessons learned to the development of new political initiatives, i.e., taking an applied political character that characterizes political analysis as a scientific discipline.” [16] To some, this approach may seem too radical, but it seems that the author has fully grasped the essence of political analysis and the core importance for its success of the thematic layer that is set in connection with giving political decision as to the main function of power and the processes associated with it a central place and fundamental importance. It will be much closer to an objective understanding of the political process in all its components if its systematization takes place in connection with the solvability of emerging problems and determination to overcome obstacles to their solutions. A clear advantage of this approach, in the opinion of the group of the authors, is demonstrated by the repeatedly reprinted textbook on the sociology of management by Z.T. Toshchenko, which is built around just such a thematic core, which allows presenting the processes of political management and power more clearly, and more holistically at the same time [15].

Of course, political analysis is not reducible to factor or characteristic analysis: the qualities of political connections and relations and their quantitative (considered) characteristics, which reflect the basic laws of existence and cognition of the political as the reality of contracts and connections, as well as the general laws of functioning and development of the political sphere of public life, are not formal but stochastic and statistically uncertain. In this regard, the identification of the logical reference point, from which every analytical cycle begins and ends, is extremely necessary, and the political decision as a prototype of political action can well be recognized, in the opinion of the group of the authors, as the initial cell that allows in the process of creating a general theory of political decisions to ascend from the abstractions of political philosophy and ideology to concrete forms of organizing the activities of people, who create their history, among other things, in political terms. Political discourse is essentially a discourse pronounced power ability of the subject to make decisions with knowledge, for the benefit of people and concerning the relief of many variants of adverse developments.

A long history of studying the processes of political governance has allowed us to identify six main phases of the process of solving political problems: initiation, forecasting, legitimation, implementation, evaluation, and termination. Many authors believe that there should be more of these phases. Some of them offer three main ones, indicating the beginning, end, and the process. It is important not only what number of individual phases, into which the process of making and executing political decisions can theoretically be divided, but rather the main turning points, at which a decision made as a conscious act based on rational calculations and prognostic expectations was implemented. Without implementation, the decision remains speculation to reality, virtuality and a good wish, and for the reality of society to be measured in connection with the implementation of the decision, it must be not just 'passing' in political terms but also implemented in practice.

At the same time, a political (and managerial) decision that took place as an act of political guiding, cannot be legally valid in modern conditions if it is incorrectly (in violation of the procedure) formalized and approved if its substantive and formal sides are not in unity, if, finally, the legal form and documentary features are not adequate to the level and position in the political structure. Such a decision, even if made, can be challenged and overturned. However, even if the decision is made following the procedure, agreed with the stakeholders, correlated with the available opportunities and resources for its implementation, and finally represents the result of a compromise, it may happen that it will not be adequately perceived, adequately interpreted, adequately executed due to failures in the organizational and structural links of the overall management process or direct opposition of interested individuals and groups.

In the phases of preparation, justification and proof of necessity in the decision being made, the initiator tries to prove to himself and others the benefits and advantages of those states of reality that are expected or planned in connection with decision-making. On the implementation phase of the decision more often its initiator is interested in the most complete and adequate to his incarnation, and therefore the monitoring of the actions of the contractor (-s), monitoring the stages of realization of decisions and interference in this process in case of evasion from accepted or regulated by the orders of actions to implement the laid down in the decision in the reality of the subject, social or

mental environment is a necessary feature which often is hijacked by government. This is understandable, but it is often not enough. As for the results of the implementation of the adopted political decisions and the assessment of the close and distant (both in space and time) consequences, this phase of the process of making and executing political decisions often falls out of the control of the initiator (this happens because in the process of achieving the goal set by the adopted decision, the idea of what, in fact, this goal consists of, often changes).

This paradox is inherent in any decision-making process, and a political decision differs in this respect mainly in that here, at each phase of its development and execution, extraneous interest and the external influence of actual or potential opposition can interfere. Therefore, as in the process of developing, making and implementing any decision in almost any sphere of human activity to manage the external world of things and objects, as well as the social environment, in the political process of implementing decisions loaded with motivating ideas about the future and achievable, at each of the phases of implementation, repetitions, deviations, iterations and frictions are possible. This is due, in the opinion of the group of the authors, to the cyclical nature of activity and thinking, reflected by the cyclical patterns of organizational and activity functions.

State political administration in the face of relevant persons, bodies and structures is a permanent character of all process of making and implementing political decisions. At each of the above phrases, the presence of state interest is more or less clearly indicated, the expression of this interest is not necessarily related to the explanation of ideological, 'mission' and other motives, but in any case, this interest takes place. Ultimately, every political decision is a way of asserting power as such. State decisions of a political kind may concern any aspect of the activities of people, their groups and communities, but when taking over (or accepting the functions of the arbiter of fate transferred as a result of agreements or traditions), state bodies and relevant officials only rarely take the initiative to launch the process of design, development and decision-making transferring this right to the upper floors of power. This is due to the peculiarities of the functioning of the state apparatus in its bureaucratic hypostasis: an official of the old bourgeois school (relatively speaking, the first and second generations), in principle, cannot accept the idea of personal initiative and personal responsibility, so the ideal of performance without reasoning is

cultivated to this day, even in the conditions of approval of new approaches to public administration and administration.

Even if at some stage, the state authorities give up the initiative in understanding the problem of political significance and its solution by political means, they remain patronizing the process and its results, as well as the quality of participants, stakeholders and experts. In some cases, the direct initiative and primacy of the state and its agents to start activities in connection with the need to make a state political decision is inconvenient or unjustified; in this case, an acceptable option is a kind of reverse delegation of the right to the initiative concerning the processes of finding acceptable solutions (due to the urgent need to remove the contradiction that has matured or has been brought to the conflict phase) to someone from trusted proxies or even completely independent political players who can make explicit and urgently necessary what state institutions should not do based on agreements or as a result of manipulative actions on their behalf and at their own risk. The state will project itself into the reality of society in different ways, and the way of preparing and making fair and reasonable decisions on the key problems of the existence of large masses of people on behalf of and/or on behalf of the highest authorities for this society is one of the most significant ways of reproducing state influence and demonstrating power. The power to rule is the power to decide and at the same time the power to avoid untimely, inappropriate and wrong decisions.

It was noted above that for a socially responsible state, the issue of the legal basis for decisions developed and proposed for the needs of public forces means, in fact, a reflexive (that is, conscious and conscious) position of a political and legal nature, from which it is quite possible (if not necessarily follows) to seek ways to express responsibility for managerial actions that would allow each of those involved in the development and implementation of state decisions to feel like a measure of their involvement in this process, and their measure of responsibility to those social groups and strata, in the interests of which such decisions, in most cases, are made. However, it should be noted that from the point of view of modern Russian law, not all issues arising here are consistently resolved.

2.

The problems outlined above can be approached in different ways. In this work, the analysis of the presence of responsibility for managerial decision-making is carried out on the example of the *Strategy of Economic and Social Development of St Petersburg for the Period up to 2035* (hereinafter – *the Strategy*), developed based on the resolution of the St Petersburg Government of May 13, 2014, № 355 *On the Strategy of Economic and Social Development of St Petersburg for the Period till 2030* and the proposed for implementation, signed by (then) Georgy Poltavchenko, Acting Governor of St Petersburg [4].

This document defines the goals and priorities of the strategic development of all spheres of life of the second largest and most important metropolis of the Russian Federation for the next 17-year period. However, at the time of preparation of this article, this document is not in line with the *Strategy of Spatial Development of the Russian Federation for the Period up to 2025*, adopted based on the decree of the *Government of the Russian Federation*, no. 207-R of February 13, 2019 [10]. And the first issue that arises here is: How exactly should an independent subject of the Russian Federation bring the strategic guidelines of its development in line with the decisions of the federal authorities adopted later? Is this a simple correction, or it necessary to agree in advance with the possibility of the radical renovation of the strategic planning document of the subnational level if suddenly there are significant discrepancies with the positions stated in the document of national significance?

Further, according to paragraph 4 of the decree Of the Government of St Petersburg *On the Strategy of Economic and Social Development of St Petersburg for the Period up to 2030*, control over its implementation was entrusted to the Vice-Governor of St Petersburg, and according to paragraph 3, the executive bodies of the city government should be guided by the provisions of *the Strategy* when carrying out their activities. Consequently, the resolution clearly defined one official responsible for the process of evaluating the adequate implementation of *the Strategy* – the Vice-Governor of St Petersburg. It should be noted that this person is not responsible for the implementation of *the Strategy* as a program document but only for monitoring the implementation of the adopted state decision. In other words, the Vice-Governor is never responsible for the implementation of this *Strategy* and the degree of its real implementation in the results of activities. One

would assume that the interpretation of performance monitoring implies the default and the general rule, some personally tied to the figure of the specific officials responsible before the Government and the highest official in St Petersburg, but in the current decision of the *Government of St Petersburg* about the approval of the *Strategy of Social and Economic Development of St Petersburg until 2035* data points defining at least conditionally, subject, recipients and the level of real responsibility for how it, at what pace and with what possible deviations and risks the adopted strategic guidelines will be implemented in the practice of urban life in the megalopolis, are absent. Thus, *the Strategy* adopted by the leadership of the city of federal significance, in fact, has neither a properly defined leader, nor a circle of performers, nor a person responsible for its implementation, and, finally, no one will control the processes of its daily implementation into reality.

In the government decree, there is an indication that the executive bodies in their activities to implement *the Strategy* should be guided by the provisions of this document. Management involves the management of processes for the implementation of certain goals and objectives, organized according to certain rules, placed in the framework of a certain temporary phased planning. The concept of ‘management’ itself does not contain a clear concept and unambiguously defined content of responsibility for the final result of process management. In the opinion of the group of the authors, this means that if there is a certain discrepancy between plans and results, there are no legal frameworks and definitions of areas and degrees of responsibility that could become a source of actions to correct the situation. Therefore, when determining the degree of discrepancy between the results of process management and the content of planned actions for the implementation of the strategic development priorities and guidelines of a particular area of activity, supervisory authorities can be guided by nothing more than absolute financial and economic indicators, which in most cases, as is known, cannot be correctly identified due to constant current correlations.

It seems that in this case, the necessary subjects, their areas, principles and degree of responsibility should be specifically identified and defined within the framework of *the Strategy*, otherwise, due to the conditionality of the formulation of resolutions and orders of state authorities, the set of management schemes and functions laid down in it will be incomplete. In this regard, the structure of *the Strategy* presented in the annexe to the

Resolution of the Government of St Petersburg of December 19, 2018, no. 771, needs to be finalized.

Section 2 of the new version of *the Strategy* is devoted to assessing the achieved social and economic goals, while it is assumed that this assessment will be made based on statistical data on the development of St Petersburg following the previously developed *Strategy for Socio and Economic Development of St Petersburg until 2030* [4]. It should be noted that the statistical data presented in this section characterize the social and economic state of the urban economy at the end of 2017 and, in fact, are the only basis for further calculations of strategic development indicators for the planned perspective period. Legally, the materials of this section can be interpreted as an absolute zero point of financial and economic calculations, which do not take into account the achieved project indicators for 2018 and the subsequent years allotted for the implementation of *the Strategy*, as well as the intermediate indicators achieved at each step. In the case of incorrect interpretation of data, distortion of the correlation in the direction of increasing or decreasing indicators above or below the economically determined error, which is often found in the calculation formulas of the Ministry of economic development of the Russian Federation, obviously erroneous data may be found at the output. However, the section does not mention the final actual carrier (object) of responsibility, which would form consolidated data for the *Committee on Economic Policy* and strategic development of St Petersburg. Therefore, contrary to what is expected in the current strategic document of the subnational level, at the moment there is a veiled area of responsibility and the subject who should be given this responsibility.

Section 3 of *the Strategy* is on the strategic analysis of competitive advantages of St Petersburg, i.e., combinations of strengths and weaknesses for the social and economic development of the city, which sets the vector to its anticipated motion to desired future states. In the opinion of the group of the authors, the very definition of this section and its content suggests that several entities should be responsible for making managerial decisions on the process of forming such an important analytical material, and first of all, the profile committees of the current government of St Petersburg, headed or controlled by vice-governors. However, the very mention of committees and vice-governors coordinating their activities are also absent in this section. Therefore, legally, such an

important component of *the Strategy* as the analysis of the competitive advantages of the city can be carried out in conditions where it is not possible to detect responsible entities identified as responsible public officials since information about this is not indicated or fixed in any special section of *the Strategy*. In the opinion of the group of the authors, it follows from this that after the adoption of *the Strategy* for implementation, no committee of the *Government of St Petersburg* in the event of an unforeseen development of the situation can bear legal or administrative responsibility for the analytical material provided in section 2.

Section 4 reveals a set of scientifically based scenarios for the development of St Petersburg, which makes it actually key since it contains the fundamental settings for the entire document. However, in this section, there are absolutely no references to any methodology and principles of the chosen method of justifying the development and selection of scenarios. It should be noted that the appeal to science and scientific approaches in Russian society is a kind of guarantee of the quality of decisions made on the management of public affairs. Although the title of the section includes words about scientific justification, no scientific argument in favour of the proposed scenarios can be found in *the Strategy* text. It seems that this is not a fatal but a significant error of the developers of this section. However, more importantly, it seems that it is quite expected that the current strategy does not specify the legal entities or representatives of the scientific community responsible for the development of the scenarios presented in it. Thus, there are grounds to argue that the area of responsibility in the development of scenarios implemented in the context of the implementation of the urban development strategy of St Petersburg is currently not defined either generically (within the framework of a special committee or working group of the *Government of St Petersburg*), or personally (e.g., named developers who proposed the most appropriate methodology for this case and/or performed the development of scenarios).

Section 6 of *the Strategy* defines the priorities, goals and objectives of the social and economic development of St Petersburg in all important vectors from the point of view of desired and expected prospects. In principle, this section is structured quite clearly and definitely and can be quite highly evaluated from the point of view of using its content for political and legal designation of responsibility to make managerial decisions within the

framework of *the Strategy* of each subject (carrier) of power and managerial competencies represented by the committees of the *Government of St Petersburg*. In the opinion of the group of the authors, such an approach would help not only to identify but also, so to speak, ‘to zone’, structurally distribute, and label all strategically important areas of city development, as well as in the future, to determine and form a scale to identify the degree of responsibility of everyone who is endowed with this responsibility. However, even in this section, there is no fixation of objects and, therefore, areas of legal responsibility. From the point of view of the law, this means that the priorities of the social and economic development of the city also remain only approximate, not quite clear, and in fact – indicative indicators that can be interpreted differently, and therefore changed at almost any time point of the Strategy implementation, and without additional approval of the entire document as a product of public discussion and consent.

Also, it is necessary to indicate that paragraph 6.2 of section 6 *Directions of Quality Improving of the Urban Environment* is not aligned with the parameters indicated in the Annex to the order of the *Government of the Russian Federation* dated February 13, 2019, no. 207-R *Strategy of Spatial Development of the Russian Federation for the Period up to 2025*. Even if, e.g., it is considered that this subsection generally corresponds to the national strategy developed after it, then it is necessary at least to make changes to this paragraph, preferably with a special indication of compliance with the document of a higher priority level.

In total, at this stage, *the Strategy* under consideration defines 18 strategic goals of the social and economic policy of St Petersburg, 54 indicators of achievement of the goal and 116 tasks of the city’s social and economic policy [7, p.108-113]. The overall goal of *the Strategy*, as stated in its text, should be determined by four strategic directions:

- 1) human capital development;
- 2) improving the quality of the urban environment;
- 3) ensuring sustainable economic growth;
- 4) ensuring the effectiveness of management and the development of civil society [7, p. 108-113].

However, the fact that in the current version of the document there is no certainty about the subjects of responsibility for making managerial decisions, neither the area of responsibility nor its degree, although all the goals are clearly outlined and the main

strategic directions are defined, inspires some concern. The lack of mention of entities that must implement certain actions to achieve objectives or delegate their execution to the relevant organizers directly management processes, maintaining the highest leadership of sectoral responsibility for implementation of indicators for the future development of the city in the framework of the adopted strategy, can lead to distortion of the direct and inverse relations management, and, therefore, can produce situations of conflict and additional (and currently not explicitly considered) risks.

Section 9 of *the Strategy* defines the terms and stages of its implementation. In the short and medium-term, the goals of *the Strategy* are implemented through state urban programs. The list, which was approved by the decree of the *Government of St Petersburg* from December 25, 2013, no. 1039, *On Procedure of Making Decisions about the Development of State Programs of St Petersburg, Creation, Implementation and Evaluation of Their Effectiveness* [2], in the current phase of work is exhaustive. However, it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that this resolution defines the areas and subjects of responsibility for making managerial decisions but not within the framework of the goals and directions of implementing the Strategy and state programs that already involve the implementation of separate, loosely related goals. This leads to an absolute dilution of responsibility for making managerial decisions on strategic goals by not quite, in the opinion of the group of the authors, justifiable creation of a kind of ‘multiplicity’ or ‘multiplication’ of responsibility subjects for state programs designed to implement common, but in managerial terms and politically still divided goals. In apparently monotonous and unified approach to identifying the sequence of decision-making and the apparently shared responsibility for the final result of the emerging intersection of the liable entities separate subjects of administrative bodies, committees of the *Government of St Petersburg* and their interest in different methods and mechanisms of state programs as areas of urban development it is possible to imagine a situation inevitably arises in which an unacceptable conflict of interest and, therefore, the law of liability.

Conclusion

Thus, it seems necessary to introduce a rule for the application of a comprehensive analysis of the documents prescribed under the applicable legislation for each type of

strategic development of regions, territorial or municipal entities in the Russian Federation to determine the presence and justification of the responsibilities of the state and municipal structures for managerial decision making, defined and lawfully established for this kind of planning. Using the example of *the Strategy* of economic and social development of St Petersburg until 2035, the group of the researches has determined that with increasing generalization of strategic development, the areas of responsibility and, accordingly, the subjects of responsibility require a higher degree and appropriate methods of formalization. This creates legal uncertainty, in which the subjects of responsibility generalized by goals have the opportunity to avoid it and/or shift it to all participants in the process or one of the specific performers of a separate state program. Therefore, among other things, the factor of conditional, formalistic responsibility of the authorities in the person of the relevant Administration's committees of the Federation's subject is created, steadily exists and reproduced.

Among the measures that can provide solutions to the problem posed in this article, it is necessary to highlight two, which are proposed to pay special attention to:

- 1) inclusion of a special table with a list of all the goals of the strategy and subjects of responsibility for each of them in the main document of strategic planning of development of each subjects of the Federation or supplementary of it, as it was done in St Petersburg, with the corresponding *Implementation Plan* (it should be noted that the second way is traditional, but, in the opinion of the group of the authors, somewhat outdated);
- 2) availability of the basis for the scientific and legal definition of the markers of the responsibility's boundaries to untimely adopt management decisions, which are necessary to achieve strategic development goals to create opportunities for a clear and unambiguous determination of the fact of legal violation of responsibility in the future.

In the opinion of the group of the authors, this approach will allow, along with other conditions, to ensure greater predictability of actions in the implementation of national strategic projects proposed by the country's leadership and avoid most of the management risks that arise in this process.

References:

1. *Anderson, Barry F.* (2002). *The Three Secrets of Wise Decision-Making*. Portland, Single Reef Press.
2. *Baturin, V.K.* (2012). On the technology of political decision-making: philosophical analysis. Almanac "Space and Time". Vol. 1. Issue 2.
3. Federal Law, no. 172-FZ of 28.06.2014 "On Strategic Planning in the Russian Federation. – URL: http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_164841/ (Date of access: 26.09.2020)
4. *Goncharov, V.V.* (2013). In search of management excellence: A guide for management personnel. Moscow, The International Research Institute for Advanced Systems.
5. *Handbook of Decision Making / Ed. by Göktuğ Morçöl.* NY-London, Routledge.
6. *Hill, M.* (2006). *Implementing public policy: governance in theory and in practice*. London, Thousand Oaks; New Delhi, SAGE Publications.
7. Law of St Petersburg no. 771-164 of December 19, 2018, On the Strategy of Social and Economic Development of St Petersburg for the Period up to 2035. – URL: <https://www.gov.spb.ru/law/?d&nd=888800018> (Date of access: 17.09.2020)
8. *Leoveanu, Andy K.* Rationalist Model in Public Decision Making. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*. 2013. Issue 4, pp.43-54.
9. Order of the Government of the Russian Federation, no. 207-R of February 13, 2019 "Strategy of Spatial Development of the Russian Federation for the Period up to 2025" / Government of the Russian Federation. – URL: <http://static.government.ru/media/files/UVAIqUtT08o60RktoOXl22JjAe7irNxc.pdf> (Date of access: 24.09.2020)
10. *Popova, O.V.* (2011). *Political analysis and forecasting: Textbook*. Moscow, Aspect Press.
11. *Rakhmankulova, N.F.* (2015). Ethical responsibility in decision-making / Almanac "Space and Time". Vol. 9. Issue 2: Space and time of decision-making.
12. Resolution of the Government of St Petersburg of 25.12.2013, no. 1039, "On the Procedure for Making Decisions on the Development of State Programmes of St

Petersburg, Formation, Implementation and Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Their Implementation” with amendments and additions / Information and legal support “Guarantor”. – URL: <https://base.garant.ru/22946086/> (Date of access: 22.09.2020)

13. Resolution of the Government of St Petersburg of 13.05.2014, no. 355, “On the Strategy of Economic and Social Development of St Petersburg for the Period up to 2030” / Committee on Health of St Petersburg. – URL: <http://zdrav.spb.ru/media/komzdrav/documents/document/file/strategiya1.pdf> (Date of access: 20.09.2020)
14. *Smolyan, G.L.* (2013). Reflexive management-the theory of making managerial decisions. The Works of Institute of System Analysis of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Vol. 63. Issue 2. Moscow, 2013, pp. 54-61.
15. *Toshchenko, J.T.* (2017). Sociology of management: Textbook and workshop for the academic baccalaureate. Moscow, Uright Publishing House.
16. *Turonok, S.G.* (2005). Political analysis: Course of lectures: Textbook. Moscow, Delo.
17. *Vlasova, E.A.; Giesbrecht, A.P.; Gnevko, V.A. et al.* (2004). Strategic analysis of the social and economic development of the region: principles, main directions, problems. St Petersburg, IME.